UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,772	12/08/2003	Erik de Groot	I20 05001US	3423

128 7590 07/31/2007
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER	
DAO, THUY CHAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/729,772	**Applicant(s)** DE GROOT ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuy Dao	**Art Unit** 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _03_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 May 2007_.

2a)□ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-25_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-25_ is/are rejected.

7)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)□ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _08 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:

1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) □ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) □ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on May 17, 2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-25 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicants' request, claims 1-2, 6, 12, 18-20, 22, and 24-25 have been amended.

4. The objection to claim 22 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. The Applicants are thanked for a thorough reply. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered.

a) Claims 12-17 (Remarks, page 9: 9 – page 10: 9):

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action (unpatentable over Dardinski in view of Spring as set forth in paragraph 7 below).

b) Claims 1-11 and 18-21 (Remarks, page 10: 10 – page 12: 6):

In the specification, [0008], lines 1-3 recites "One aspect is a method of source control. A level of source control is enabled from a selection of at least two levels. A version number of an object is set either automatically or manually, depending on the level" (emphasis added); and

[0009], lines 7-13 recites, "...In some embodiments, the selectable level of source control is no source control and a version number is entered manually when the control strategy is saved. In some embodiments, the selectable level of source control is basic source control and a version number is automatically incremented when the control strategy is saved. In some embodiments, the selectable level of source control is full source control and a version number is automatically incremented when the control strategy is checked-in" (emphasis added).

In light of the specification, Spring (secondary reference) also teaches the newly added limitations:

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., a base level which version numbers are assigned manually, col.9: 16-37; an advanced control level which version numbers are changed automatically, col.9: 38-59),

wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level (e.g., said two levels have two different attributes: manually and automatically changing version numbers, col.9: 16-59); and

automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system, depending on said enabled level (e.g., col.3: 47 – col.4: 49).

c) Claims 22-25 (Remarks, page 12: 7 – page 14: 14):

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action (further in view of Spring as set forth in paragraph 8 below).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski (art of record, US 6,754,885) in view of Spring (art of record, US Patent No. 6,971,093).

Claim 1:

Dardinski discloses *a method of source control, comprising:*

operating a source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Process Control System (source control system) resides on Workstation 11, col.8: 35-43; Controllers 10A-B, col.8: 44-59; FIG. 2, Controllers 10A-B communicates with Devices 12A, Sensors 24 and 26 to provide process control on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29)*;*

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels (e.g., at least two levels in Revision Levels, col.59: 49-54; Version History, col.59: 56 – col.60: 31)*; and*

automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system (e.g., an object as Control Algorithm object, col.79: 21-25, col.77: 51-60; FIGs. 46-47, setting version number, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38),

wherein said object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski discloses different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), Version History (FIG. 52), section 2.1.1.4 Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system] depending on said enabled level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses:

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., a base level which version numbers are assigned manually, col.9: 16-37; an advanced control level which version numbers are changed automatically, col.9: 38-59), *wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level* (e.g., said two levels have two different attributes: manually and automatically changed version numbers, col.9: 16-59); and

automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system, depending on said enabled level (e.g., col.3: 47 – col.4: 49).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *providing a capability to switch said enabled level of source control to another level of said levels of source control* (e.g., col.59: 49-54, col.59: 56 – col.60: 31).

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *automatically setting said version number is based on a degree of change to said object* (e.g., FIGs. 46-47, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38).

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *storing attributes associated with said object in a database* (e.g., col.79: 21-25; col.77: 51-60).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said plurality of levels of source control comprises level none, level basic, and level full* (e.g., col.70: 46 – col.71: 24).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said level none, said method further comprises: receiving user-entered text for said version number; setting a created-by name set upon receiving a first save changes request; setting a modified-by name upon receiving a save changes request; setting a date-created date upon receiving said first save changes request; and setting a version date upon receiving said save changes request* (e.g., FIG. 48, Revision Editor, col.54: 39-64; FIG. 49: Revision Dialog Box, col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said level basic, said method further comprises: automatically incrementing said version number upon receiving a save changes request, including a first save changes request; setting a created-by name upon receiving said first save changes request; setting a modified-by name upon receiving said save changes request, including a first save changes request; setting a date-created date upon receiving said first save changes request; setting a version date upon receiving said save changes request, including a first save changes request; and displaying said version number* (e.g., FIG. 50: col.55; 23-63).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version number is incremented differently for minor changes than for major changes* (e.g., col.55: 65 – col.56: 48).

Claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said level full, said method further comprises: supporting a qualification life cycle model; providing a version control system toolbar and menu; automatically incrementing said version number upon check-in, including a first check-in wherein said version number is* *generated; displaying said version number; setting a created-by name upon said first check-in; setting a modified-by name upon said check-in, including said first check-in; in; setting a date-created date upon said check-in, including said first check- setting a version date upon said check-in; receiving a check-in comment; and providing a version history and audit trail* (e.g., FIGs. 52-53: col.59: 57 – col.60: 31).

Claim 11:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version number is incremented differently for minor changes than for major changes, according to user preferences* (e.g., col.55: 65 – col.56: 48).

Claim 12:

Dardinski discloses *a process control system, comprising:*

a computer comprising a source control system with a selectable level of source control for at least one control strategy (e.g., selectable level of source control as Control Levels, col.70:32-39; col.70: 46 – col.71: 25; a control strategy as Control Algorithm object, col.2: 25-42, col.9: 33-43)*; and*

a network coupling said computer to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Network 14, Workstation 11, Controllers 10A-B, Device 12, col.8: 23-59; FIG. 2, process control in blocks 29-32 to control Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29)*;*

wherein said at least one control strategy in said source control system is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said control strategy (e.g., Control Algorithm object (control strategy) is downloaded to field controllers/devices to provide control process on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col. 2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43, 20-29).

Dardinski discloses different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), Version History (FIG. 52), section 2.1.1.4 Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *a* *plurality of levels of source control, wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses:

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., a base level which version numbers are assigned manually, col.9: 16-37; an advanced control level which version numbers are changed automatically, col.9: 38-59),

wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level (e.g., said two levels have two different attributes: manually and automatically changed version numbers, col.9: 16-59).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

Claim 13:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *a database to store source control information associated with said at least one control strategy, including a version number* (e.g., col.79: 21-25; col.77: 51-60).

Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable level of source control is no source control and further wherein a version number is entered manually when said at least one control strategy is saved* (e.g., col.54: 39-64).

Claim 15:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable level of source control is basic source control and further wherein a version number is* *automatically incremented when said at least one control strategy is saved* (e.g., col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).

Claim 16:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable level of source control is full source control and further wherein a version number is automatically incremented when said at least one control strategy is checked-in* (e.g., col.55: 23-63).

Claim 17:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable level of source control is selected from the group consisting of: a preference, a license, an installation configuration, and a user interface* (e.g., col.70: 32-39; col.70: 46 – col.71: 25).

Claim 18:

As set forth in claims 1 and 12, Dardinski discloses *a method for providing a source control system for a process control system, comprising: operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control; receiving in said source control system a selection from at least two levels of source control for an object of said source control system; providing a user-enterable version number* or *an automatically incremented version number when an-said object is stored, wherein said object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control.*

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose *providing a user-enterable version number when an-said object is stored, if said selection is a first level; and providing an automatically incremented version number when an-said object is stored, if said selection is a second level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses:

a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59);

providing a user-enterable version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a first level and providing an automatically incremented version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a second level (e.g., col.9: 16-46, manually setting a version number when module is newly created (first level) and automatically setting a version number when said module is modified/updated (second level)).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

Claim 19:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *providing an automatically incremented version number when said object is checked-in, if said selection is a third level of said plurality of levels of source control* (e.g., col.55: 23-63).

Claim 20:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *changing said selection to another of said plurality of levels of source control* (e.g., col.54: 39-64; col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).

Claim 21:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *updating attributes of said object based on said selection* (e.g., col.53; 54 – col.54: 38).

8. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski in view of Cronce (art of record, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0156719 A1) and further in view of Spring.

Claim 22:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of providing configurable levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 23-59)*;*

at least one control strategy of said source control system; wherein said at least one control strategy is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said at least one control strategy (e.g., col.9: 20-29; col.2: 25: 42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose *receiving a request for a level of support, determining whether a full level of support is licensed, determining whether an option for a basic level of support is selected, setting said level of support to full, if said full level of support is licensed, and setting said level of support to basic is said option is selected.*

However, in an analogous art of providing licensed software, Cronce further discloses *receiving a request for a level of support, determining whether a full level of support is licensed, determining whether an option for a basic level of support is selected, setting said level of support to full, if said full level of support is licensed, and setting said level of support to basic is said option is selected* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level and a basic level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control* (e.g., col.9: 16-59) *including a full level* (e.g., col.9: 38-59) *and a basic level* (e.g., col.9: 16-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated. Cronce further discloses *a default for said level of support is none* (e.g., [0037], [0058]).

Claim 24:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of changing configurable levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59; FIG. 2, col.9: 20-29)*;*

an object of source control, which is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Cronce further discloses *receiving a request from a user to change a level, determining whether a full level is licensed, determining whether said request is to change from none to basic, determining whether said request is to change from basic to none, performing said request when said request is to change from none to basic or from basic to none, and storing a new level* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060], full, partial, basic, trial levels; user stops using software after trial period (none) or trial period expires).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level, and a basic/none level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control* (e.g., col.9: 16-59) *including a full level* (e.g., col.9: 38-59) *and a basic/none level* (e.g., col.9: 16-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base/none and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

Claim 25:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of updating version attributes based on a level of source control, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g. FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59)*;*

an object of said control system (e.g., col.2: 25-42)*;*

determining whether said object is new (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38)*;*

setting a version number to a first version number, when said object is new (e.g., FIG. 52, col.59: 57 – col.60: 5)*;*

updating version attributes of said object (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38)*; and* *incrementing said version number, when said object is not new, wherein said object is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object* (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 7-14; col.59: 57 – col.60; 5).

Cronce further discloses *determining whether an object is licensed, determining whether a basic level is selected, receiving a save changes request for said object, updating version attributes of said object according to whether said full level is licensed and whether said basic level is selected* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level, and a basic level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Spring further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control* (e.g., col.9: 16-59) *including a full level* (e.g., col.9: 38-59) *and a basic level* (e.g., col.9: 16-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spring into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to correctly identify different versions of a software module as suggested by Spring (e.g., col.3: 48 – col.4: 49) as well as apply base and/or advanced levels of source control (e.g., col.9: 16-59).

9. Claims 1, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski in view of US Patent No. 6,662,357 to Bowman-Amuah (art made of record, hereinafter "Bowman-Amuah").

Claim 1:

Dardinski discloses *a method of source control, comprising:*

operating a source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Process Control System (source control system) resides on Workstation 11, col.8: 35-43; Controllers 10A-B, col.8: 44-59; FIG. 2, Controllers 10A-B communicates with Devices 12A, Sensors 24 and 26 to provide process control on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29)*;*

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels (e.g., at least two levels in Revision Levels, col.59: 49-54; Version History, col.59: 56 – col.60: 31)*; and*

automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system (e.g., an object as Control Algorithm object, col.79: 21-25, col.77: 51-60; FIGs. 46-47, setting version number, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38)*,*

wherein said object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski discloses different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), Version History (FIG. 52), section 2.1.1.4 Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system] depending on said enabled level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses:

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., a base level which version numbers are assigned manually and an advanced control level which version numbers are changed automatically, col. 63: 55-60),

wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level (e.g., said two levels have two different attributes: manually and automatically changed version numbers, col. 63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3); and *automatically or manually setting a version number of an object of said source control system, depending on said enabled level* (e.g., col. 63: 22 – col.64: 10).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to create, maintain, or retrieve multiple versions of source code in a component-based development environment as suggested by Bowman-Amuah (e.g., col.62: 60 – col.63: 31).

Claim 12:

Dardinski discloses *a process control system, comprising:*

a computer comprising a source control system with a selectable level of source control for at least one control strategy (e.g., selectable level of source control as Control Levels, col.70:32-39; col.70: 46 – col.71: 25; a control strategy as Control Algorithm object, col.2: 25-42, col.9: 33-43)*; and*

a network coupling said computer to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Network 14, Workstation 11, Controllers 10A-B, Device 12, col.8: 23-59; FIG. 2, process control in blocks 29-32 to control Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29)*;*

wherein said at least one control strategy in said source control system is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said control strategy (e.g., Control Algorithm object (control strategy) is downloaded to field controllers/devices to provide control process on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col. 2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43, 20-29).

Dardinski discloses different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), Version History (FIG. 52), section 2.1.1.4 Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *a plurality of levels of source control, wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses:

enabling in said source control system a level of source control from a selection of a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., a base level which version numbers are assigned manually and an advanced control level which version numbers are changed automatically, col.63: 55-60),

wherein said plurality of levels comprise a first level and a second level that contains one or more features not contained in said first level (e.g., said two levels have two different attributes: manually and automatically changed version numbers, col.63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth above.

Claim 18:

As set forth in claims 1 and 12, Dardinski discloses *a method for providing a source control system for a process control system, comprising: operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control; receiving in said source control system a selection from at least two levels of source control for an object of said source control system; providing a user-enterable version number* or *an automatically incremented version number when an-said object is stored, wherein said object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control.*

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose *providing a user-enterable version number when an-said object is stored, if said selection is a first level; and providing an automatically incremented version number when an-said object is stored, if said selection is a second level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses:

a plurality of levels of source control (e.g., col.63: 55-60);

providing a user-enterable version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a first level and providing an automatically incremented version number *when said object is stored, if said selection is a second level* (e.g., col.63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

10. Claims 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski in view of Cronce and further in view of Bowman-Amuah.

Claim 22:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of providing configurable levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 23-59)*;*

at least one control strategy of said source control system; wherein said at least one control strategy is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said at least one control strategy (e.g., col.9: 20-29; col.2: 25: 42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose *receiving a request for a level of support, determining whether a full level of support is licensed, determining whether an option for a basic level of support is selected, setting said level of support to full, if said full level of support is licensed, and setting said level of support to basic is said option is selected.*

However, in an analogous art of providing licensed software, Cronce further discloses *receiving a request for a level of support, determining whether a full level of support is licensed, determining whether an option for a basic level of support is selected, setting said level of support to full, if said full level of support is licensed, and setting said level of support to basic is said option is selected* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level and a basic level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level and a basic level* (e.g., col.63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 24:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of changing configurable levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59; FIG. 2, col.9: 20-29)*;*

an object of source control, which is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Cronce further discloses *receiving a request from a user to change a level, determining whether a full level is licensed, determining whether said request is to change from none to basic, determining whether said request is to change from basic to none, performing said request when said request is to change from none to basic or from basic to none, and storing a new level* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060], full, partial, basic, trial levels; user stops using software after trial period (none) or trial period expires).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level, and a basic/none level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level and a basic/none level* (e.g., col.63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth above.

Claim 25:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of updating version attributes based on a level of source control, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g. FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59)*;*

an object of said control system (e.g., col.2: 25-42)*;*

determining whether said object is new (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38)*;*

setting a version number to a first version number, when said object is new (e.g., FIG. 52, col.59: 57 – col.60: 5)*;*

updating version attributes of said object (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38)*; and* *incrementing said version number, when said object is not new, wherein said object is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object* (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 7-14; col.59: 57 – col.60; 5).

Cronce further discloses *determining whether an object is licensed, determining whether a basic level is selected, receiving a save changes request for said object, updating version attributes of said object according to whether said full level is licensed and whether said basic level is selected* (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Neither Dardinski nor Cronce explicitly discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level, and a basic level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Bowman-Amuah further discloses *a plurality of levels of source control including a full level and a basic level* (e.g., col.63: 22-60; col.62: 60 – col.63: 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bowman-Amuah into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth in claim 1 above.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER